



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/602,945

06/24/2003

John F. Grubb

RL-1627DIV

1816

7590 02/12/2007  
ALLEGHENY TECHNOLOGIES INCORPORATED  
1000 Six PPG Place  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222-5479

EXAMINER

DOVE, TRACY MAE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1745

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

02/12/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/602,945	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GRUBB, JOHN F.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Tracy Dove	<b>Art Unit</b> 1745	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 36-40, 42 and 43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 36-40, 42 and 43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1745

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office Action is in response to the communication filed on 11/22/07. Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive. Claims 36-40, 42 and 43 are pending. This Action is made FINAL, as necessitated by amendment.

#### ***Claims Analysis***

Claim 36 recites the terms "up to", "less than about" and "less than", which all encompass the value zero. Claims 40 and 43 recites the term "no more than", which encompasses the value zero.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 36-40, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 36 recites "the interconnect consisting essentially of a ferritic stainless steel consisting essentially of...", which is not supported by the specification as filed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1745

Claims 36-40, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 36 recites the phrase “less than about” multiple times. This phrase is indefinite because it is unclear what is encompassed by the phrase “less than about”. For example, 1.01 is “about” 1, but not “less than” 1.

Claims 39, 40 and 43 are indefinite because the claims recite open language (“comprises”; “includes”) regarding the steel alloy of claim 36.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 36-40, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpkins et al., US 6,613,468 in view of Taruya et al., JP 2000-294256, as evidenced by Woods, US 5,424,144.

Simpkins teaches a solid oxide fuel cell comprising an electrolyte 40 disposed between and in ionic communication with an anode 30 and a cathode 50 to form an electrochemical cell 10. The solid oxide fuel cell further includes an interconnect 24 (Figure 1; 2:61-66). The solid electrolyte may comprise zirconium oxide (zirconia) (3:20-42). The interconnect is electrically conductive and may comprise a ferritic stainless steel material (6:46-67).

Simpkins does not explicitly teach the ferritic stainless steel of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1745

However, Taruya teaches a fuel cell comprising a separator (interconnect) having a specific ferrite stainless steel composition. Respective component elements of the ferrite stainless steel composition are 10.5-35 wt% of chromium, 0-6 wt% of molybdenum, not more than 0.018 wt% of carbon, not more than 0.2 wt% of titanium and not more than 0.3 wt% of niobium (abstract). The ferrite stainless steel separator may be contained in a fuel cell (0020). Taruya teaches the molybdenum range is preferably 0.5-5 wt% of the ferrite stainless steel composition (0041). Taruya is silent regarding the claimed properties of the ferrite stainless steel. However, since the compositional limitations are disclosed in Taruya, then the recited properties would have been inherent in the teachings of Taruya absent any proof to the contrary.

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because one of skill would have been motivated to use the ferrite stainless steel composition of Taruya for the interconnect of Simpkins in view of the teaching by Simpkins that a ferritic stainless steel material may be used for the interconnect. Furthermore, the courts have ruled a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (Claims to titanium (Ti) alloy with 0.8% nickel (Ni) and 0.3% molybdenum (Mo) were not anticipated by, although they were held obvious over, a graph in a Russian article on Ti-Mo-Ni alloys in which the graph contained an actual data point corresponding to a Ti alloy containing 0.25% Mo and 0.75% Ni.).

One of skill would have known that the interconnect (for a solid polymer fuel cell) of Taruya could have been used for the interconnect (for a solid oxide fuel cell) of Simpkins. This

Art Unit: 1745

is evidenced by Woods which teaches a separator suitable for use in various known types of fuel cells, such as solid oxide fuel cells and polymer electrolyte fuel cells. The separator is generally a ferrous metal separator (column 1). Therefore, Woods teaches a ferrous metal separator for use in either a solid oxide fuel cell or a polymer electrolyte fuel cell.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 11/22/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the 103(a) rejection of claims 36-40, 42 and 43 over Simpkins et al., US 6,613,468 in view of Taruya et al., JP 2000-294256, Applicant argues Simpkins teaches a ferritic stainless steel that is coated may be used as an interconnect in solid oxide fuel cells. Applicant asserts this teaching actually teaches away from the claimed composition. However, Simpkins merely teaches the ferritic stainless steel may be coated. Therefore, Simpkins teaches and suggests that the ferritic stainless steel may be provided with or without a coating for use as an interconnect in solid oxide fuels. Simpkins states "ferritic stainless steels...may be coated...to achieve the same desired properties" as uncoated ferritic stainless steels. Thus, Simpkins clearly does not teach away from the claimed invention because Simpkins teaches the ferritic stainless steels may be coated or uncoated.

Applicant argues one of skill in the art would not look to the materials of construction of a fuel cell that operates at 80C (the polymer type fuel cell of Taruya) for a fuel cell that operates at approximately 800-1000C (the SOFC of Simpkins). Examiner points out that Simpkins teaches ferritic stainless steel interconnects are known for use in a SOFC. Taruya is applied to show a teaching of a specific ferritic stainless steel interconnect for use in fuel cells. Examiner

Art Unit: 1745

has provided further evidence (Woods) that the ferritic stainless steel interconnect of a polymer electrolyte fuel cell may be used for the ferritic stainless steel interconnect of a SOFC.

Applicant argues Simpkins and Taruya are not properly combined because Simpkins teaches a solid oxide fuel cell and Taruya teaches a solid polymer electrolyte fuel cell. However, it is known in the art the interconnect materials of one type of fuel cell, in addition to other materials such as manifold and housing materials, may be substituted for interconnect materials of another type of fuel cell (see Woods). Both Simpkins and Taruya teaches ferritic stainless steel interconnect materials for fuel cells. *Applicant has not provided any persuasive argument why the interconnect materials of a polymer electrolyte fuel cell is not applicable as an interconnect material of a solid oxide fuel cell.* Applicant points out that some materials of a solid oxide fuel cell may not be used for a polymer electrolyte fuel cell. Examiner agrees. However, Examiner is not relying upon using the electrolyte or electrode materials of the polymer electrolyte fuel cell of Taruya for the solid oxide fuel cell of Simpkins. Such arguments are not applicable to the rejections of record.

Examiner requested Applicant reference the specific section of Taruya that teaches “there would be no reasonable expectation of success in using components designed for use in one type of fuel cell in other types of fuel cells”, as asserted by Applicant. The section pointed to by Applicant on page 7 of the remarks is referencing the electrolyte and electrode materials, which is not relevant to the rejection of record. Examiner is not attempting to substitute the polymer electrolyte of Taruya for the solid oxide electrolyte of Simpkins. Applicant argument that a ferritic stainless steel interconnect was “designed for use” in a polymer electrolyte fuel cell is still not supported. The prior art clearly teaches ferritic stainless steel interconnects are used

Art Unit: 1745

("designed for use") in solid oxide fuel cells (Simpkins) and in polymer electrolyte fuel cells (Taruya).

Applicant further states Taruya does not teach the claimed ferritic stainless steel alloy because the alloy of Taruya does not include the addition of tantalum. This argument is not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention. See at least claim 36 "at least one of niobium, titanium OR tantalum". Applicant argues "not of the alloys of Table 1, or otherwise disclosed in Taruya or Simpkins have the claimed composition". It is unclear what Applicant is intending to argue. Only one alloy present in the prior art is necessary to anticipate or render obvious the claimed composition. Taruya does not teach away from the claimed invention, as asserted by Applicant.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.




Art Unit: 1745

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tracy Dove whose telephone number is 571-272-1285. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (9:00-7:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pat Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

February 5, 2007

  
**TRACY DOVE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**